

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Faulk (U.S. Patent No. 5,818,705) in view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,198,638). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicants' invention, as set forth in claim 1, is directed to a power adapter comprising a first housing and a second housing remote from the first housing. An AC input receptacle is provided in the first housing and a voltage converting circuit is enclosed within the first housing and electrically connected to the AC input receptacle, the voltage converting circuit converting input AC power into a DC voltage. A voltage regulating circuit is electrically connectable to the voltage converting circuit and is enclosed within the second housing, the voltage regulating circuit maintaining and outputting the DC voltage from the voltage converting circuit.

The Examiner acknowledges that Faulk does not disclose a voltage regulating circuit. The Examiner also acknowledges that Faulk does not disclose a separate housing remote from the first housing, let alone a voltage regulating circuit which is contained in the second housing. Lee is cited as disclosing a voltage regulating circuit.

The examiner does not contend that either Faulk or Lee disclose or suggest a remote second housing. Instead, the Examiner relies on the case of *Nerwin v. Erlichman* 168 USPQ 177, 179 as standing for the proposition that "... constructing a formerly integral structure in various elements involves only routine skill in the art." This, however, was not the holding in *Nerwin v. Erlichman*.

Nerwin v. Erlichman involved an interference in which the issue was not patentability but instead was whether one of the parties was able to make a count of the interference. In this instance, the Court held that the fact that a structure is integral does not preclude its consisting of various elements. This has absolutely nothing to do with the question of obviousness or non-obviousness.

A case that did deal with this issue is *Mooney v. Brunswick Corp.*, 489 F. Supp. 544, 561, 206 USPQ 121 (E.D. Wis. 1980), *aff'd*, 663 F.2d 724, 212 USPQ 401 (7th Cir. 1981),

in which the Court held that there is no per se rule that making something in one piece that was formerly made in two or more pieces renders it obvious. Rather, the Court held one must look at the improvement that results from the new construction and whether that improvement of construction itself is obvious from the prior art. Although the case simply dealt with making something in one piece that was formerly made in two or more pieces, the same logic obviously would apply to the reverse situation, that is, making something in two or more pieces that was formerly made in one piece.

Specifically, applying this reasoning to the present situation, it is seen that numerous improvements have resulted from providing two housings rather than one, and by the selective placement of components in the two housings, and that there is nothing in the prior art that would suggest either the use of the two housings or the specific disposition of parts within those housings. More specifically, there is nothing in the prior art that would suggest disposing the AC input receptacle and voltage converting circuit in one housing and the voltage regulating circuit in another circuit remote from the first housing.

By providing two housings and placing the AC connectors and the AC/DC converter in one housing and placing the voltage regulators in a second housing, Applicant provides a power adapter which has a relatively simple structure, a high efficiency and improved output performance. Moreover, because the first housing need only contain the voltage converting circuit, the power adapter has increased thermal performance and improved electromagnetic interference characteristics.

Additionally, since the power converter circuit electronics are separated from the input connector style (for example, $110V_{AC}$, $220V_{AC}$), which vary by geography throughout the world, production costs can be reduced because each of the input connectors and the voltage regulating circuits can be separately manufactured and then matched to form the desired power adapter. For example, with the prior art power adapters, if there were five different input connector styles and 5 different output voltages required, 25 different connectors would have to be produced (5 input connectors X 5 required output voltages). With the present power adapter, the five different input connectors could be produced separately from the five voltage regulating portions. Then the desired input connector style can be matched to desired voltage regulating

portion. Thus, only 10 separate items need be manufactured (5 input connector styles + 5 voltage regulating portions).

In view of the foregoing it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is clearly not rendered obvious by the combination of Faulk and Lee.


Claims 2-9 are dependent either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are therefore patentable for the same reasons as well as because of combinations of the features set forth in these claims with the features set forth in the claim(s) from which they depend.

In view of the foregoing this application is now believed to be in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on June 19, 2006.

James A. Finder

Name of applicant, assignee or
Registered Representative



Signature

June 19, 2006

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Finder

Registration No.: 30,173

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700

MP:jh